

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, the drawings are objected to based on the reasons set forth on page 2 of the present Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that the drawings contain reference characters "116" in Fig. 3 and "S707" in Fig. 7 that are not mentioned in the specification. With respect to reference character "S707", Applicant adds "(S707)" after the number "203" on line 14 of page 19 of the specification. Applicants response with respect to reference character "116" is forthcoming.

Claims 1-12 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Takiara (U.S. Patent No. 6,941,387). Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Takiara in view of Iizuka et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,015).

§102(e) Rejections (Takiara) - Claims 1-3

Claims 1-3 are rejected over Takiara based on the reasons set forth on pages 3-4 of the present Office Action. Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Takiara does not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein the main board is mounted on the modular television," as recited in claim 1. The Examiner believes that the PC module of Fig. 3 corresponds to the claimed hard disk module. However, nowhere does Takiara disclose or suggest that the PC module has a main board that is mounted on a modular television. The 1394 interface module 357 is only used

to connect to other AV devices (e.g., an MPEG1 module; *see col. 8, line 64 - col. 9, line 6*), but nowhere is it disclosed or suggested that a main board is mounted on a modular television.

Yet further, with respect to claim 1, the Examiner appears to pick and choose the different modules described in Takihara, and the elements thereof, as allegedly satisfying the claimed hard disk drive module and the elements set forth in claim 1. For example, the Examiner cites the motherboard 341 of the PC module as allegedly satisfying the claimed main board of the hard disk drive module, and the Examiner cites the memories 122 and 123 of the MPEG 1 video deck module as allegedly satisfying the claimed memory of the hard disk module. Essentially, the Examiner picks and chooses different elements of different modules described in Takihara to allegedly satisfy the specific claimed elements of the hard disk module of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established that a hard disk module with the specific claimed elements is satisfied by Takihara.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that Takihara does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 and 3 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claim 1.

§103(a) Rejections (Takahara / Iizuka) - Claims 4-12

With respect to independent claims 4 and 10, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Iizuka does not make up for the deficiencies of Takihara.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 5 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 4 and 10.

Further, with respect to claim 5, neither of the references, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests that a hard disk is initialized by a control portion when the control portion receives the IRQ signal. Iizuka does disclose that a hard disk can be initialized, however, there is no disclosure or suggestion that a hard disk is initialized when the control portion receives an IRQ signal.

With respect to independent claims 6, 9, and 12, Applicants amend these claims, as indicated herein, and submit that these claims are patentable based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Applicants submit that claim 7 and 8 are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claims 4 and 5.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/054,890

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q66377

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 29, 2006